

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have carefully studied the outstanding Official Action. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the application, claims 289-311 are currently pending. Claims 1-267 have been cancelled previously and claims 268-288 have been withdrawn.

In the present response, previously withdrawn claims 268 - 288 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 289, 296, 303-305 and 307 are amended. Claims 290-295, 297-302, 306 and 308-311 are unchanged.

Claims 289-308 and 310 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Korenaga, et al. (U.S. 2003/0118288).

The allowability of claims 309 and 311 is noted with appreciation.

Applicants express their appreciation to Examiner William Coleman for the courtesy of an interview which was granted to applicants' representative, Sanford T. Colb (Reg. No. 26,856). The interview was held at the USPTO on March 4, 2008. The substance of the interview is set forth in the Interview Summary.

In the interview, proposed amendments to claim 289 were discussed vis-à-vis the prior art of record of Korenaga, et al. The Interview Summary Record states, in relevant part, "Applicants unofficial proposed amendment to claim 289 overcomes the prior art."

Applicants have accordingly amended independent claim 289, as proposed, to recite "at least one optical fiber, having a core, mounted on said substrate along said first generally parallel planar surface, said substrate and said at least one optical fiber being cut by a common transverse notch having at least one inclined surface extending entirely through said core of said at least one optical fiber, said first generally parallel planar surface and partially through said

substrate, and defining at least one end of said at least one optical fiber at said at least one inclined surface; and at least one optical element adhesively mounted at least partially within said notch, said at least one optical element including at least one reflective optical surface facing an end of said at least one optical fiber lying at one of said at least one inclined surface and also facing said second parallel planar surface of said substrate”, which distinguishes over the prior art. Support for the amendment is found, inter-alia, in Figs. 9A-12C and the description thereof.

Claims 296, 303-305 and 307 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for all elements recited therein in light of the amendments to claim 289.

Korenaga et al. describes an optical package substrate and a molding method therefor, which provides for easy mounting of optical elements.

As discussed at the interview, Korenaga does not show or suggest an optical device, as recited in amended claim 289, including at least one optical fiber, having a core, mounted on a substrate, where the substrate and the optical fiber are cut by a common transverse notch having at least one inclined surface extending entirely through the core of the at least one optical fiber, a first generally parallel planar surface of the substrate and partially through the substrate, and defining at least one end of the optical fiber at the inclined surface and at least one optical element adhesively mounted at least partially within the notch, where the at least one optical element includes at least one reflective optical surface facing an end of said at least one optical fiber lying at one of said at least one inclined surface and also facing a second parallel planar surface of the substrate, and that claim 289 is therefore patentable.

Claims 290-311 each depend directly or ultimately from claim 289 and recite additional patentable subject matter and therefore are deemed allowable.

Applicants reserve the right to pursue the claims as filed in the context of a continuation application.

Application No. 10/595,372  
Amendment dated April 22, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of January 25, 2008

Docket No.: 06727/0204303-US0

In view of the foregoing, all of the claims are deemed to be allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Dated: April 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

S. Peter Ludwig

Registration No.: 25,351

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, NY 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212)527-7701(Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant